## **REMARKS**

Claim Status

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application, and claims 1-6 were previously withdrawn from consideration. This paper amends claims 7, 8, 9, 12, and 14. Claims 7 and 12 are the independent claims of the application under consideration. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Section 112 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 7-16 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action stated independent claim 7, lines 9-10, recite "storing in a first database a record of true universal part numbers and amounts of parts ordered or backordered." The Office Action notes that page 14, lines 12-14 of the application describes the storing as being directed to the "true part numbers." The Examiner felt the same issue was present in independent claim 12.

Responsive to the Section 112 rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 7 and 12 to recite "storing in a first database a record of the true part numbers and amounts of parts ordered or backordered," as recited by the specification (See application, page 14, lines 12-14).

Claims 8-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7, and claims 13-16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12.

Accordingly, these claims are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

The Office Action also rejected claims 7-16 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated claim 7, line 6 recites "a set of universal part numbers" and line 9 recites "true universal part numbers" and that it is allegedly not clear whether the two types of "universal part numbers" claimed are equivalent or distinct. The Examiner stated the same issue is present in independent claim 12.

Claim 7, line 9, has been amended to recite "storing in a first database a record of true part numbers and amounts of parts ordered or backordered." Claim 12 has also been amended in the same manner to recite "storing in a first database a record of true part numbers and amounts of parts ordered or backordered." Amended claims 7 and 12 do not confuse "a set of universal part numbers" as recited in line 6 of claim 7, with "a record of true part numbers" recited in line 9 of claim 7. Support for amended claims 7 and 12 can be found in the specification, page 14, lines 12-14.

Claims 8-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7, and claims 13-16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12.

Accordingly, these claims are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

The Office Action rejected claim 8, specifically line 2, which included the phrase "such as", which allegedly renders the claim indefinite as unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. The Examiner stated the same issue is in claim 13, line 2.

Claims 8 and 13 are amended to recite "wherein each of said set of universal part numbers is associated with other part numbers that may be associated with different suppliers or manufacturers." With this amendment, the concerns noted in the Office Action have been obviated.

Accordingly, these claims are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable  To discuss any matter pertaining to the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 947-0700.  Having made an effort to bring the application in condition for allowance, a timely notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2007

 /Steven A. Swernofsky/
Steven A. Swernofsky
Reg. No. 33,040

The Swernofsky Law Group
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700